

Date: Fri, 22 Apr 94 04:30:07 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #180  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Fri, 22 Apr 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 180

Today's Topics:

    "NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading  
        /AA? (I'm confused) (4 msgs)  
    Illinois anti scanner legislation

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: Thu, 21 Apr 1994 07:59:37 +0000  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!uknet!  
demon!g8sjp.demon.co.uk!ip@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: "NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Apr20.193002.3527@mixcom.mixcom.com>  
    kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com "kevin jessup" writes:

> When a "codeless" tech "upgrades" to TECH plus 5WPM code, he simply  
> gets a CSCE for the 5WPM. No forms get sent to the FCC. At least  
> not when I upgraded. I was told to just save the form in case  
> someone asked to see it.

Umm ... The '610 which you filled out as your application to be tested should  
end up at the FCC (via the VEC). The CSCE is for you to keep, cherish, and  
guard with your life, since it's the only proof \*you\* have of HF privs.

> Also, when I received my license (March of 1993) there was no  
> indication other than TECHNICIAN with PRIMARY privileges. (Will

> this change for future technicians?)

As I understand it, that's the way it is. No differentiation on the license between Technician and Technician w/HF.

> So...what is to prevent a codeless tech from operating 10 meter  
> SSB? Who would know that he did NOT upgrade?? Does anybody  
> really care? ;-))

Same thing that prevents a Novice from operating on 10M SSB. You hear 'Novice' calls there all the time, right? As is being discussed in other threads elsewhere, you can no longer tell a license class by the format of the call.

--

Iain Philipps

N2TLY (if I could find my license, I'd be able to tell you the class :-)

-----

Date: Wed, 20 Apr 1994 14:37:37 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!csn!col.hp.com!news.dtc.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!cupnews0.cup.hp.com!jholly@network.ucsd.edu

Subject: /AA? (I'm confused)

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jerry Dallal (jerry@hnrc.tufts.edu) wrote:

: I confuse easily. Would someone straighen me out about  
: this?

: Suppose a technician upgrades to advanced. Part 97.9(b)  
: says that advanced privileges can be used as long as the  
: individual has a CSCE. 97.119(e) says that a modifier must  
: be used after the call sign. In this case it would be /AA.

: My confusion arises because the FCC does not require a  
: change of call signs. Does this mean that if NONNN were to go  
: from Technician to Advanced without requesting a change in  
: call sign, (s)he would be required to use NONNN/AA while the  
: upgrade was being processed but could go back to plain old  
: NONNN once the new license was received!!!???

: Thanks.

Yes. During the interim period the FCC database does not show the correct license class, hence the need for the /AA. Once the license is issued the database is correct and hence, no need for the /AA.

Jim

-----

Date: 21 Apr 94 13:33:44 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: /AA? (I'm confused)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> My confusion arises because the FCC does not require a  
> change of call signs. Does this mean that if NONNN were to go  
> from Technician to Advanced without requesting a change in  
> call sign, (s)he would be required to use NONNN/AA while the  
> upgrade was being processed but could go back to plain old  
> NONNN once the new license was received!!!!???

yes, that's right.

the /xx is to show you have something in work to the world and that explains why someone that's got a novice license in the callbook (or the FCC's database) is on 14.003 running CW if they sign xx#xxx/AE. the point of this is to allow licensed operators to enjoy their new privileges the day they pass the test.

once you receive the official license, you drop the upgrade identifier.

some of us are happy that we aren't required to change calls. the call sign groups are for merely having a system for assigning the different format calls (and when the "vanity call" rules come about, you could still get something that could be out of joint relative to what license you really hold..)

bill wb9ivr

-----

Date: 20 Apr 94 19:45:41 GMT  
From: korie!newsworthy.West.Sun.COM!abyss.West.Sun.COM!spot!myers@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: /AA? (I'm confused)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article Lwt@cup.hp.com, jholly@cup.hp.com (Jim Hollenback) writes:

>Jerry Dallal (jerry@hnrc.tufts.edu) wrote:

>: I confuse easily. Would someone straighen me out about  
>: this?

>

>: Suppose a technician upgrades to advanced. Part 97.9(b)  
>: says that advanced privileges can be used as long as the  
>: individual has a CSCE. 97.119(e) says that a modifier must

>: be used after the call sign. In this case it would be /AA.  
>  
>: My confusion arises because the FCC does not require a  
>: change of call signs. Does this mean that if NONNN were to go  
>: from Technician to Advanced without requesting a change in  
>: call sign, (s)he would be required to use NONNN/AA while the  
>: upgrade was being processed but could go back to plain old  
>: NONNN once the new license was received!!!???

>  
>: Thanks.  
>  
>Yes. During the interim period the FCC database does not show the correct  
>license class, hence the need for the /AA. Once the license is issued  
>the database is correct and hence, no need for the /AA.  
>  
>Jim  
>

I don't have my copy of Part 97 here, but I believe the /AA identifier must be used when using privileges authorized by the CSCE. In other words, if NONNN is a Technician, and upgrades to Advanced, he/she would use /AA on HF frequencies other than those afforded by the 5WPM CSCE (i.e. Tech+), and he/she would not use the /AA identifier on frequencies his Technician license allowed.

---

\* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ, DoD#: j | Views expressed here are  
\*  
\* (310) 348-6043 | mine and do not necessarily \*  
\* Dana.Myers@West.Sun.Com | reflect those of my employer  
\*  
\* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests \*

-----  
Date: Wed, 20 Apr 1994 16:54:13 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!ncar!csn!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!  
jws@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: /AA? (I'm confused)  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

> : My confusion arises because the FCC does not require a  
> : change of call signs. Does this mean that if NONNN were to go  
> : from Technician to Advanced without requesting a change in  
> : call sign, (s)he would be required to use NONNN/AA while the  
> : upgrade was being processed but could go back to plain old  
> : NONNN once the new license was received!!!???

Yes, but the /AA is only needed when you're using frequencies reserved for

Advanced class and above only. If you're a Technician and upgrade, you don't need to use /AA when operating in the bands you had access to when you were a Technician class licensee.

John Schmidt, NK0R  
jws@fc.hp.com

-----  
Date: Wed, 20 Apr 1994 14:33:54 GMT  
From: news.bu.edu!att-in!att-out!walter!dancer.cc.bellcore.com!not-for-mail@purdue.edu  
Subject: Illinois anti scanner legislation  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>: >FLASH - IMPORTANT - ACT NOW...  
>: >  
>: >HOUSE BILL 4180 - 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
>: >STATE OF ILLINOIS 1993 AND 1994  
>: >  
>: >INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE CROSS ON 12 APRIL 1994  
>: >  
>: >SYNOPSIS AS INTRODUCED 720 ILCS 5/31-9 NEW  
>: >  
>: >LRB8814416RCMB Sec.31-9  
>: >  
>: >Amends the Criminal code of 1961. Prohibits the possession of a  
>: >receiver or transceiver capable of monitoring or broadcasting  
>: >police, fire, or other municipal radio frequencies unless the  
>: >device operates exclusively on alternating current power. Penalty  
>: >is a Class B misdemeanor. Exempts peace officers, fire officials,  
>: >municipal employees, agents acting in an official capacity, and  
>: >the press.

ATTENTION!!!!

Note the impact of this proposed law is far beyond any existing "scanner" law found in other states. This proposed law makes POSSESSION ANYWHERE a crime. If this law is passed, everyone in Illinois that currently owns a DC powered scanner will be technically required to dispose of them or be in violation of the law. Likewise, anyone driving through or otherwise visiting the state of Illinois and has in his/her possession a DC powered scanner will be in violation of the law.

Under this proposed law, if you have a mobile scanner or a portable in the trunk of your car, in your home, etc. you are violating the law.

As to the exemptions, isn't it nice to know that as citizens, you are afforded less rights than members of the press.

If the state of Illinois passes this law, watch for it to be emulated in other states.

Standard Disclaimer- Any opinions, etc. are mine and NOT my employer's.

-----  
Bill Sohl (K2UNK) BELLCORE (Bell Communications Research, Inc.)  
Morristown, NJ                      email via UUCP              bcr!cc!whs70  
201-829-2879 Weekdays            email via Internet      whs70@cc.bellcore.com  
-----

Date: Thu, 21 Apr 1994 03:02:27 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!csulb.edu!csus.edu!netcom.com!  
mrmoose@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CoICtL.6ur@cbnewsd.cb.att.com>, <2p1e19\$m12@clarknet.clark.net>,  
<2p3egi\$cbp@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>  
Subject : Re: Illinois anti scanner legislation

One could use an inverter (to generate a 110 VAC square wave from 12 VDC) to power an AC scanner in the car. Tripp Lite, based in Chicago, makes inverters. Hmm...maybe they know someone in the Illinois legislature...c'mon now...

-----  
Date: 21 Apr 94 23:25:39 GMT  
From: ncd.com!newshost.ncd.com!sheridan.ncd.com!steve@uunet.uu.net  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CoICtL.6ur@cbnewsd.cb.att.com>, <2p1e19\$m12@clarknet.clark.net>,  
<2p3egi\$cbp@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>  
Subject : Re: Illinois anti scanner legislation

I understand everyone's concern... but last I heard is that there is a full federal pre-emption by FCC concerning this sort of thing for amateurs I suspect that it would be difficult to convince the cop on the beat that you are within your rights...and it might even take a court case to get it beaten into the state's head that the exemption exists... but it should be sufficient.

Am I wrong about this? And I would think that pointing out the exemption

would certainly get the state to add amateurs to the list.

Any comments?

Steve KA6S

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #180

\*\*\*\*\*